

New NLO Monte-Carlo parton shower scheme for W/Z/H boson production at LHC and DIS at HERA

S. JADACH

IFJ-PAN, Kraków, Poland

Partly supported by Polish Government grant N N202 128937.

Presented at Institut für Theoretische Physik (KIT),
Karlsruhe University, July 19th, 2011

More material on <http://jadach.web.cern.ch/>



Outline of the talk, motivation

- I am going to explain in a simple pictorial way the essential idea and practical toolbox of the collinear factorization in QCD:
 - (i) factorizing hard process from the hadron part,
 - (ii) defining PDF (parton distribution function),
 - (iii) notion of universality, factorization scheme dependence.
- This factorization, together with the earlier understanding from QED of the soft photon/gluon limit resummation, is the cornerstone of all practical calculations of the QCD effects in the hadron colliders, like LHC and Tevatron.
- For the future analysis of data from both colliders it will be critical to put theoretical pQCD calculation at the new unprecedented precision level, both for the Standard Model processes and for any New Physics phenomena.
- In the second part of my talk I shall briefly outline newly developed more powerful method of the collinear factorization in perturbative QCD, which is implementable using Stochastic Simulation methods (Monte Carlo), and therefore opening new avenues for the practical QCD calculations.

PART I

Collinear Factorization Theorems in perturbative QCD for pedestrians



Collinear factorization in QCD: why?

Comparing QCD with Quantum Electrodynamics (QED):

- in QED **infrared (IR)** infinities (divergences) from integrating over small photon energies are removed (regularized) by providing photon temporarily with a small mass, and later on, while combining real and virtual Feynman diagrams they always cancel; photon mass can be finally reset to zero. (Cancellations work up to a fixed first, second, ... n-order, also when re-summed to ∞ order).
- AND contribution from **collinear (COL)** singularities, (from integration over small angles between photons and fast electrons) are large but finite; mass of electron acts as a natural regulator.



Collinear factorization in QCD: why?

Complications in the perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics (pQCD), in strong interactions at high energies $\gg 1\text{ GeV}$:

- gluon and some quarks are *massless*, hence no convenient natural mass IR/COL regulators – it is the wave function of hadrons (confinement) which does the job,
- QCD has non-abelian charge *colour* instead of simpler electric charge of QED.


Theoretical and practical solutions to the above problems in pQCD has been found in early 80-ties, and today is referred to as “**Collinear Factorization Theorems**” of pQCD.

All present day practical pQCD calculation are based on them!



QCD and pQCD

Last ~40 years



1976–83, "Gold-rush epoch":
Most of principles of practical
pQCD calculations established:
CFTs, PDFs, NLO, etc.,
at the e^+e^- , DIS, DY
processes.
But experiment 20 years
behind theory at the time!



Basic toolbox of standard CFTs in pQCD

All present day practical pQCD calculation are based on the Collinear Factorization Theorems (CFTs).

CFTs provide the following basic toolbox and features:

- Definition of the **hard process Matrix element** (ME) and methodology of calculating it order by order in pQCD, (somewhat similarly as in QED).
- Definition of the **PDF's = parton distribution functions**; methodology of extracting them from data in one process, one energy scale and exploiting them in another process, another energy scale.
- Methodology of **combining PDFs and hard process ME** into predictions for semi-inclusive experimental observables in the collider experiments like total production and/or decay rates, effective mass and angle distributions, “fatness of the hadronic jets” etc.




Shortcomings of the standard CFTs of the 80's

Standard CFTs of 80's are less and less suited for the present hadron collider experiments:

- They are ideal for total cross sections (decay rates) and one-dimensional inclusive distributions, with all other many particles integrated over, summed over.
- Present collider experiments can see final state in fine details and measure x-sections/rates factor > 10 more precisely than 20 years ago, when standard CFTs were formulated,
- Fast computers and powerfull stochastic simulation methods (Monte Carlo) available nowadays to calculate not only total rates or 1-dim. inclusive distributions but also to simulate **EXCLUSIVE** multiparton final states! Like what is really seen in the modern collider experiments!
- CFTs of 80's not suited for present demands/opportunities!
CFTs are now a bottleneck in pQCD!!!

OLD PARTON MODEL (prehistory of QCD)

Old parton model by lucid R. Feynman and clever J. Bjorken:




PDF=parton distr. function in Feynman parton model

Richard Feynman has stated:

quark q , as seen by the electron probe e , carries the same fraction x of the proton energy E_p , regardless how fast is proton:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dQ^2 dx} = \frac{d\sigma_{ep}}{dQ^2} D_{q \in p}(E_p, x), \quad D(E_p, x) = D(E'_p, x) = D(x)$$

(proton energy $E_p = \frac{1}{2} Q^2/x$ is in the Breit frame, see next slide)




PDF=parton distr. function in Feynman parton model

Richard Feynman has stated:

quark q , as seen by the electron probe e , carries the same fraction x of the proton energy E_p , regardless how fast is proton:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dQ^2 dx} = \frac{d\sigma_{ep}}{dQ^2} D_{q \in p}(E_p, x), \quad D(E_p, x) = D(E'_p, x) = D(x)$$


(proton energy $E_p = \frac{1}{2} Q/x$ is in the Breit frame, see next slide)



PDF=parton distr. function in Feynman parton model

Feynman assumed that partons were non-interacting.

Then $D(E, x) = D(E', x) = D(x)$ for massless partons results directly and **TRIVIALY** from a Lorentz z-boost!




$$p'_q = B p_q = \begin{bmatrix} xE' \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ xE' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} xE \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ xE \end{bmatrix}, \quad E'_{proton} \equiv E'_p = \gamma E_p.$$



Deep inelastic scattering (DIS) in Breit frame

Strictly speaking Feynman's manipulation of PDF by means of slowing/accelerating proton works for DIS process in the **Breit frame**, where quark is backscattered and has energy $E_q = \frac{1}{2}Q = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{Q^2}$, while proton energy is $E_p = \frac{1}{2}Q/x$.




In reality Bjorken-Feynman conjecture in pQCD is broken, parton distribution (PDF) depends weakly on Q : $D(\ln Q, x)$. In QED this Q -dependence was discovered by Gribov and Lipatov; in pQCD it is attributed to Altarelli and Parisi.



Deep inelastic scattering (DIS) in Breit frame

Strictly speaking Feynman's manipulation of PDF by means of slowing/accelerating proton works for DIS process in the **Breit frame**, where quark is backscattered and has energy $E_q = \frac{1}{2}Q = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{Q^2}$, while proton energy is $E_p = \frac{1}{2}Q/x$.




In reality Bjorken-Feynman conjecture in pQCD is broken, parton distribution (PDF) depends weakly on Q : $D(\ln Q, x)$. In QED this Q -dependence was discovered by Gribov and Lipatov; in pQCD it is attributed to Altarelli and Parisi.

Why and where Feynman was “wrong”?


- Feynman indeed would be (almost) right in the small coupling limit $\alpha_S \rightarrow 0$,
(what effectively happens in pQCD at extremely high energies)
- But in pQCD $\alpha_S \neq 0$ and let's find out the consequences.
- Assuming that we $\alpha_S \ll 1$, it is reasonable to start from Bjorken-Feynman scaling as a 0-th order approximation.
- To grasp the essence of the logarithmic violation of B-F scaling, it is enough to calculate 1-st order pQCD effect due to emission of a single real and virtual gluon, $1g$.
- The reason for the $\ln(Q)$ dependence of PDF will be that: **$1g$ correction of pQCD to PDF changes by $\alpha_S \ln(Q'/Q)$** , when comparing $Q=10\text{GeV}$ and $Q'=1000\text{GeV}$ DIS experiments. Let's look into this...




Emission of 1 gluon, 3 diagrams and phase space



3 Feynman diagrams and the **real gluon** phase space in Breit frame:



Collinear and soft infrared (IR) singularities




Gluon production ME (squared) has very strong peaks in the collinear and soft regions of the phase space (Breit frame Cartesian):

- **IR soft:** gluons with small energy $k^0 \rightarrow 0$
- **COLlinear initial:** gluon almost collinear with init. quark
- **COLlinear final:** gluon almost collinear with outgoing quark

Contributions from these IR regions are balanced by virtual contributions.



The same 1-gluon space in logarithmic variables




Three regions of general interest ($k^\pm = k^0 \pm k^3$):

- **HARD**: gluon in hard process
- **ISR**: initial state radiation
- **FSR**: final state radiation




1-gluon space in logarithmic lightcone variables



Gluons from only two regions only can affect x_{Bj} and $\text{PDF}(x_{Bj})$:

- **HARD**: gluon in hard process
- **ISR**: initial state radiation
- **Interesting emission region inside dashed line.**

NB. The same ISR+HARD region in the Cartesian (non-log) variables looks as follows:




Let's concentrate on ISR+HARD,
unresolved FSR combined with virtuals.

ISR collinear divergence (both real and virtual) is regulated/cut-off by
incalculable proton bound state wave function.



The source of $\ln(Q)$ dependence of PDF in a nutshell




What happens when we calculate 1-gluon correction to PDF twice, for $Q = 10 \text{ GeV}$ and $Q' = 1000 \text{ GeV}$, and compare results? **In a nutshell:**

- the essential difference comes from the integral over the dark blue trapezoid segment of the length = $\ln(Q'/Q)$.
- IR soft and FSR gluons don't play any role!



The source of $\ln(Q)$ dependence of PDF in a nutshell




What happens when we calculate 1-gluon correction to PDF twice, for $Q = 10\text{GeV}$ and $Q' = 1000\text{GeV}$, and compare results? **In a nutshell:**

- the essential difference comes from the integral over the dark blue trapezoid segment of the length = $\ln(Q'/Q)$.
- IR soft and FSR gluons don't play any role!



The same in terms of simple formulas



$$\frac{d\sigma}{dQ^2 dx} = \frac{d\sigma_{eq}}{dQ^2} \left[F^{(0)}(x) + F^{[1]}(Q, x) \right],$$


$$F^{[1]}(Q, x) = \frac{2C_F\alpha_S}{\pi} \int_{Q_0}^Q \frac{dk^+}{k^+} \int_{m_p}^Q \frac{dk^-}{k^-} W(k^+, k^-, Q) F^{(0)}\left(x + \frac{k^+}{Q}\right) + F^{(0)}(x) V_{\text{virt.}},$$

$$\Delta\Gamma\left(\frac{Q'}{Q}\right) = F^{[1]}(Q', x) - F^{[1]}(Q, x) = \frac{2C_F\alpha_S}{\pi} \int_{Q_0}^Q \frac{dk^+}{k^+} \int_Q^{Q'} \frac{dk^-}{k^-} \omega\left(\frac{k^+}{Q}\right) F^{(0)}\left(x + \frac{k^+}{Q}\right) +$$

The area of the **dark blue segment** = $\int_{Q_0}^Q \frac{dk^+}{k^+} \int_Q^{Q'} \frac{dk^-}{k^-} = \ln \frac{1}{\delta} \ln \frac{Q'}{Q}$.



... and equivalent familiar formulas




$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\Gamma\left(\frac{Q'}{Q}\right) &= F^{[1]}(Q', x) - F^{[1]}(Q, x) \\ &= \frac{2C_F\alpha_S}{\pi} \int_{\delta}^{1-x} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} \ln \frac{Q'}{Q} \frac{1 + (1-\alpha)^2}{2(1-\alpha)} F^{(0)}\left(\frac{x}{1-\alpha}\right) + \text{virt.} \\ &= \ln \frac{Q'}{Q} \int_x^1 \frac{dz}{z} \left\{ \frac{2C_F\alpha_S}{\pi} \frac{1+z^2}{2(1-z)} \right\}_+ F^{(0)}\left(\frac{x}{z}\right), \quad \alpha = \frac{k^+}{k_{\max}^+}. \end{aligned}$$

The part {...} is familiar Altarelli-Parisi QCD LO evolution kernel.

Hard (pink) and proton (blue+magenta) segments cancel! Why?



More discussion...



Proton (blue+magenta) segments cancel! Why?

The low k^T (light blue) proton segment (including corresponding virtuals):

$$F_{\text{pr.}}^{[1]}(Q, x) = \frac{2C_F\alpha_S}{\pi} \int_{Q_0}^Q \frac{dk^+}{k^+} \int_{m_p}^Q \frac{dk^-}{k^-} W(k^+, k^-, Q) F^{(0)}\left(x + \frac{k^+}{Q}\right) + F^{(0)}(x) V_{\text{pr.}},$$


and the fact that it is the same $F_{\text{pr.}}^{[1]}(Q, x) = F_{\text{pr.}}^{[1]}(Q', x)$,

is a highly plausible **conjecture**, which cannot be proved in pQCD, because proton bound state wave function is involved.

However, we shall give precise prescription how to extract it from the data.



More discussion...



The hard emission (pink) segments cancel! Why?

For the high k^T (pink) hard segment (including virt.):

$$F_{\text{hard}}^{[1]}(Q, x) = \frac{2C_F\alpha_S}{\pi} \int_{Q\delta}^Q \frac{dk^+}{k^+} \int_{\mu_F}^Q \frac{dk^-}{k^-} W(k^+, k^-, Q) F^{(0)}\left(x + \frac{k^+}{Q}\right) + F^{(0)}(x) V_{\text{pr.}},$$

the equality $F_{\text{hard}}^{[1]}(Q, x) = F_{\text{hard}}^{[1]}(Q', x)$ is provable in pQCD.


It results from the scale-invariance of the phase space and matrix element

$$W(k^+, k^-, Q) = W\left(\frac{k^+}{Q}, \frac{k^-}{Q}\right).$$

The main issue is how to remove IR/Coll. singularities from it, see next...



For many gluons the same triple-factor structure



3 factors come from 3 segments of the phase space:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dQ^2 dx} = \frac{d\sigma_{eq}}{dQ^2} F(Q, x),$$

$$F(Q, x) = \int_0^1 dz D\left(\frac{\mu_0}{m_p}, x_0\right) \int_0^1 dz \Delta\Gamma\left(\frac{\mu_F}{\mu_0}, z\right) \int_0^1 dz' C\left(\frac{Q}{\mu_F}, z'\right) \delta(x - z'zx_0)$$

[Struc.Funct.] = [Initial PDF] x [Evolution Segm.] x [Coefficient Funct.]



Three essential How to's of the Collinear Factorization toolbox

1. How to get “Evolution segment” $\Delta\Gamma$ from pQCD?

Back to 1-gluon case. Using pQCD we define/calculate:

$$\Delta\Gamma\left(\frac{\mu_F}{\mu_0}, z\right) = \Gamma(\mu_F, z, \varepsilon) - \Gamma(\mu_0, z, \varepsilon).$$

In a graphical form the above is:

The diagram illustrates the graphical representation of the evolution segment $\Delta\Gamma$. On the left, $\Delta\Gamma$ is shown as a blue trapezoidal area between two horizontal lines representing the renormalization scale μ . The top line is at μ_F and the bottom line is at μ_0 . The area is bounded by a vertical line at μ_0 and a diagonal line that slopes downwards from left to right, ending at μ_F . This area is labeled $\Delta\Gamma$. This is followed by an equals sign. To the right of the equals sign, the expression is shown as the difference of two terms. The first term is a pink trapezoidal area representing Γ at scale μ_F . It has a vertical line at μ_F on the left and a diagonal line sloping downwards to the right. A small infinity symbol ∞ is placed to the left of this vertical line, indicating divergence. The second term is another pink trapezoidal area representing Γ at scale μ_0 . It has a vertical line at μ_0 on the left and a diagonal line sloping downwards to the right. The entire graphical equation is $\Delta\Gamma = \text{[blue trapezoid]} = \text{[pink trapezoid]} - \text{[pink trapezoid]}$.

No proton in Γ any more! Pure pQCD! Massless quark!

Any kind of IR/Coll. regulator is OK in Γ , as it cancels in $\Delta\Gamma$.

For instance dimensional regularization factor $(k^T)^\varepsilon$ can be used, or massive quark and gluon, whatever.

Idealized “Bare PDF” $\Gamma(\mu_F, z, \varepsilon)$ is process-independent and divergent.



2. How do we get hard part C from pQCD?

In a graphical form the subtracted hard process ME (“Coefficient Function” in the “DIS slang”) is defined as:

$$C_{\text{DIS}} = \left[\text{Diagram 1} \right] = \left[\text{Diagram 2} \right] - \left[\text{Diagram 3} \right]$$

It is calculated in **pure pQCD** as an IR-finite difference:

$$C_{\text{DIS}}(Q/\mu_F) = F_{\text{bare}}(Q, \varepsilon) - \Gamma(\mu_F, \varepsilon).$$

Finite C -function is **process dependent!**

It will be different in W/Z production and in DIS process.



3. How do we define, extract from data and exploit the process independent PDF of a hadron?

PDF is obtained by **from DIS exper. data** by means of “decapitating” the DIS Struc. funct. using C_{DIS} of pQCD:

$$D_p = \text{[Diagram: blue trapezoid with 'proton' label, x-axis from } m_p \text{ to } \mu_F \text{, y-axis up]} = \text{[Diagram: blue trapezoid with 'proton' label, x-axis from } m_p \text{ to } \mu_F \text{, y-axis up, with a red scissors icon cutting the top-right corner]} - \text{[Diagram: pink trapezoid with 'DIS' label, x-axis from } \mu_F \text{ to } \mu_F \text{, y-axis up]}.$$

Next, we may plug in this (process indep.) universal PDF, D_p , into a **prediction** for the DY process:

$$F_{\text{DY}} = \text{[Diagram: blue trapezoid with 'DY' label, x-axis from } m_p \text{ to } \mu_F \text{, y-axis up, with a rounded top-right corner]} = \text{[Diagram: blue trapezoid with 'proton' label, x-axis from } m_p \text{ to } \mu_F \text{, y-axis up]} + \text{[Diagram: pink trapezoid with 'DY' label, x-axis from } \mu_F \text{ to } \mu_F \text{, y-axis up]}.$$

provided we have calculated/subtracted hard process ME for the DY process in pQCD.

(“Beheaded Str.Fun.”=PDF now gets new head:-)



Evolution of PDF and SF is the same, but...

The universal PDF evolves with the same evolution factor as the structure function, see graphic representation of that:

$$D_p = \text{[Diagram 1]} = \text{[Diagram 2]} + \text{[Diagram 3]}$$

Although PDF is process-independent,
it is not only hadron-type-dependent,
but also **factorization-scheme-dependent!**



Last not least: Factorization Scheme (FACS) dependence


Observables, Structure Funct. are FACS-independent, but 3 components, D_0 , $\Delta\Gamma$ and C_{hard} are FACS-dependent.

Changing the “evolution variable” type generates FACS-dependence.

- Dimensional regularization, \overline{MS} , $t = \ln k^T$, k^T -ordering:



- Angular-ordering, $t = \eta = \ln(k^+/k^-)$, friendly to eikonal/soft limit:



- “DIS scheme”, $t = \ln(k^-)$, $t = \ln Q$, virtuality-ordering:



For example, each of the above has a different size or absent numerically dominant component $\left(\frac{\ln(1-z)}{1-z}\right)_+$ in C .

[Altarelli-Ellis-Martinelli, Nucl.Phys B157 (1979)].



Summary on Factorization Theorems toolbox in pQCD

- pQCD can predict SF at Q , provided we measure it at Q_0 ,
- using clever construction of an universal PDF, we are able to “teleport” an experimental knowledge on partons inside fast hadron, from one process to another.
- hard part ME can be calculated order by order using Feynman diagrams (almost like in QED).
We know how to combine it with PDFs.
- Can we use classic CFTs to construct Monte Carlo?
Unfortunately, we cannot... See next part II.



PART II


more on theory of
the collinear factorization
in a form suitable for
the Monte Carlo

- Classic CFTs were formulated by:
 - △ 1979, EGMPR [Ellis, Georgi, Machacek, Politzer, Ross],
 - △ 1980, CFP [Curci, Furmanski, Petronzio],
 - △ 1980-85, CSS [Collins, Sterman, Soper] and others.
- Why not suited for the parton shower MC?
 - ★ Over-subtractions
 - ★ Non-conservation of the 4-momenta
- How to modify (cure) them?
 - Introduce time-ordered exponential at the early stage, already when isolating/subtracting coll/IR singular parts.
 - Redefine projection operators for extracting singular (coll.) parts such that 4-mom. is conserved.



EGMPR scheme of collinear factorization (1978)

“Raw” factorization of the IR collinear singularities



- Cut vertex M : spin sums and Lips integrations over all lines cut across
- C_0 and K_0 are 2-particle irreducible (2PI)
- C_0 is IR finite, while K_0 encapsulates **all** IR collinear singularities
- Use of the axial gauge essential for the proof
- Formal proof given in EGMPR NP B152 (1979) 285
- Notation next slide

$$M = C_0(1 + K_0 + K_0^2 + \dots) = C_0 \frac{1}{1 - K_0} \equiv C_0 \Gamma_0$$

Curci-Furmanski-Petronzio collinear factorization scheme (1979)

Curci Furmanski and Petronzio (CFP) have customized (1979-80) EGMPR to \overline{MS} and exploited it in practice to NLO level.

$$\begin{aligned} F &= C_0 \cdot \frac{1}{1 - K_0} = C \left(\alpha, \frac{Q^2}{\mu^2} \right) \otimes \Gamma \left(\alpha, \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right), \\ &= \left\{ C_0 \cdot \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \mathbb{P}) \cdot K_0} \right\} \otimes \left\{ \frac{1}{1 - \left(\mathbb{P} K_0 \cdot \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \mathbb{P}) \cdot K_0} \right)} \right\}, \\ \Gamma \left(\alpha, \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) &\equiv \left(\frac{1}{1 - K} \right)_{\otimes} = 1 + K + K \otimes K + K \otimes K \otimes K + \dots, \\ K &= \mathbb{P} K_0 \cdot \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \mathbb{P}) \cdot K_0}, \quad C = C_0 \cdot \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \mathbb{P}) \cdot K_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Ladder part Γ corresponds to MC parton shower

C is the hard process part

\mathbb{P} is the projection operator: $\mathbb{P} = P_{spin} P_{kin} PP$



Over-subtraction problem in translating CFP/EGMPR into Monte Carlo

By examining to LO in CFP (real emissions)

$$F = C_0 \cdot \frac{1}{1 - K_0} = C_0 \cdot \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \mathbb{P}) \cdot K_0} \otimes \Gamma, \quad \Gamma = \frac{1}{1 - \left(\mathbb{P} K_0 \cdot \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \mathbb{P}) \cdot K_0} \right)},$$

we see enormous oversubtractions/cancellations:

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{1}{1 - \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}\right)} = 1 + \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}\right) + \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}}\right)^2 + \dots$$

while from RGE and explicit LO calculations we get

$$\Gamma = e^{+\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} = 1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{2!} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + \dots$$

The same in EGMPR, translating ε -poles $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} = \int_0^{\mu_F} \frac{dk^T}{k^T} \left(\frac{k^T}{\mu_F}\right)^\varepsilon$ of CFP.

NO WAY to build Monte Carlo on that!

We need the exponent directly from the Feynman diagrams!!!



Correcting for over-subtractions

$$F = \frac{1}{1-K_0} = C_0 \cdot \overleftarrow{\mathbb{R}}_\mu[K_0] \cdot \exp_{TO} \left(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}' \left\{ {}^s K_0 \cdot \overleftarrow{\mathbb{R}}_s[K_0] \right\} \right) (\mu)$$

$$\overleftarrow{\mathbb{R}}_\mu(K_0) = \overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}_\mu \left[\frac{1}{1-K_0} \right] \equiv 1 + \overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}_\mu[K_0] + \overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}_\mu[K_0 \cdot K_0] + \overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}_\mu[K_0 \cdot K_0 \cdot K_0] + \dots$$

No over-subtraction due to presence of:

- \exp_{TO} = **time ordered exponential** in the evolution variable = log of the factorization scale, next slide.
- Operator $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}$ is defined **recursively** (similarly as β -functions in Yennie-Frautschi-Suura 1961 subtraction scheme):

$$\overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}_\mu[K_0] = K_0 - \mathbb{P}'_\mu\{K_0\},$$

$$\overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}_\mu[K_0 \cdot K_0] = K_0 \cdot K_0 - \mathbb{P}'_\mu\{{}^{s_2} K_0\} \cdot \mathbb{P}'_{s_2}\{{}^{s_1} K_0\} - \mathbb{P}'_\mu\{{}^{s_2} K_0 \cdot \overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}_{s_2}[K_0]\} - \overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}_\mu[K_0] \cdot \mathbb{P}'_\mu\{K_0\},$$

$$\overleftarrow{\mathbb{B}}_\mu[K_0 \cdot K_0 \cdot K_0] = K_0 \cdot K_0 \cdot K_0 - \mathbb{P}'_\mu\{{}^{s_3} K_0\} \cdot \mathbb{P}'_{s_3}\{{}^{s_2} K_0\} \cdot \mathbb{P}'_{s_2}\{{}^{s_1} K_0\} - \dots$$

- **Modified \mathbb{P}'_μ new projection operator is the key point!**
- $\mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}'_\mu$ conserves four-momentum, contrary to EGMPR.



Modified projection operator $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}'_\mu$

- $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}'_\mu$ does spin projection as \mathbb{P} of CFP,
- $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}'_\mu(A)$ extracts singular part from integrand A (not from $\int A!$)
- where A is *at most single-log* coll. divergent!
- $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}'_\mu$ acts on integrand, leaves out Lorentz inv. phase space, sets on-shell all (cut) real momenta towards hard process
- $\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}'_\mu$ sets upper limit μ on the phase space for all real (cut) partons towards the hadron using $\mu > s(k_1, \dots, k_n)$,
- examples of $s(k_1, \dots, k_n) = \max(k_i^T / \alpha_i)$, or $s = \max(k_i^T)$,

Bottom line:

This new factoriz. sch. cures both problems of EGMPR/CFP:

- (i) over-subtraction and
- (ii) 4-momentum non-conservation.

Solid basis for MC featuring pQCD beyond LO, both in the hard part and the ladder part is in place.



Hierarchy of scales in T.O. exponential

$$\begin{aligned} \exp_{TO} (\mathbb{P}'_{\mu}\{A\}) (\mu) = & 1 + \mathbb{P}'_{\mu}\{A\} + \mathbb{P}'_{\mu}\{s_2 A\} \cdot \mathbb{P}'_{s_2}\{s_1 A\} \\ & + \mathbb{P}'_{\mu}\{s_3 A\} \cdot \mathbb{P}'_{s_3}\{s_2 A\} \cdot \mathbb{P}'_{s_2}\{s_1 A\} + \dots \end{aligned}$$

For $A = \int dLips(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n) f(k_1, \dots, k_n)$, with k_i being on-shell emitted partons, notation $\{s_3 A\}$ defines $s_3 = a(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \max(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and in

$$\mathbb{P}'_{\mu}\{s_3 A\} \cdot \mathbb{P}'_{s_3}\{s_2 A\} \cdot \mathbb{P}'_{s_2}\{s_1 A\}$$

the entire integrand multiplied by

$$\theta_{\mu > s_3 > s_2 > s_1}$$

instead of EGMPR/CFP common limit:

$$\theta_{\mu > s_3} \theta_{\mu > s_2} \theta_{\mu > s_1}$$



PDFs, evolution and kernels...

In $F(Q) = C(Q, \mu) \cdot D(\mu)$, hard process part is $C(Q, \mu) = C_0 \cdot \overleftarrow{\mathbb{R}}_\mu[K_0]$.
We also define **exclusive** PDF (ePDF) as the integrand in:

$$D(\mu) = \exp_{TO} \left(\overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}' \left\{ {}^s K_0 \cdot \overleftarrow{\mathbb{R}}_s[K_0] \right\} \right) (\mu) = \exp_{TO}(K).$$

LO and NLO truncations of the **exclusive** evolution kernel K_μ are:

$$K_\mu^{LO} = \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}'_\mu \left\{ {}^s K_0 \right\}, \quad \text{taken at } \mathcal{O}(\alpha^1),$$

$$K_\mu^{NLO} = \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}'_\mu \left\{ {}^s K_0 + K_0 \cdot (1 - \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}') \cdot K_0 \right\}, \quad \text{truncated at } \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2).$$

The standard **inclusive** x -dependent $D(\mu, x)$ obeys by construction an ordinary evolution equation:

$$\partial_\mu D(\mu, x) = \mathcal{P} \otimes D(\mu)(x)$$

with the traditional DGLAP **inclusive kernel** being

$$\mathcal{P}(x) = \int d\text{Lips} \delta \left(x = \frac{\sum k_i^+}{E_0} \right) \delta \left(1 - \frac{s}{\mu} \right) \overleftarrow{\mathbb{P}}'_\mu \left\{ {}^s K_0 \cdot \overleftarrow{\mathbb{R}}_s[K_0] \right\}.$$




Another important ingredient:

New method of inserting NLO corrections in the hard process and the ladder parts, similar to that of Yennie-Frautschi-Suura, (which we have practiced in QED MCs for LEP)



YFS-like method of NLO correcting HARD process



YFS-like method of NLO correcting HARD process

$$\sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-1 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-2 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } 1 \end{array} \right|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-1 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-2 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } 1 \end{array} \right|^2 + \sum_{r=1}^m \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-1 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-2 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } 1 \end{array} \right|^2 \right\}$$


where the following NLO real/virtual corrections/distributions

$$\left| \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-1 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-2 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } 1 \end{array} \right|^2 = \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-1 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-2 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } 1 \end{array} \right|^2 + \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-1 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-2 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } 1 \end{array} \right|^2 - \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-1 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-2 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } 1 \end{array} \right|^2 - \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-1 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } n-2 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Diagram } 1 \end{array} \right|^2.$$

are free of any double or single collinear/soft singularities.



NLO-corrected middle-of-the-ladder kernel, $\sim C_F^2$



$$\left| \begin{array}{c} \text{gluon} \\ \text{quark} \\ \text{gluon} \end{array} \right|^2 = \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{gluon} \\ \text{quark} \\ \text{gluon} \end{array} \right|^2 + \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{gluon} \\ \text{quark} \\ \text{gluon} \end{array} \right|^2 - \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{gluon} \\ \text{quark} \\ \text{gluon} \end{array} \right|^2$$

$$\bar{D}_B^{[1]}(x, Q) = e^{-S_{ISR}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} x \\ \vdots \\ n \\ \vdots \\ n-1 \\ \vdots \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{array} \right\}^2 + \sum_{p=1}^n \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ n \\ \vdots \\ n-1 \\ \vdots \\ p \\ \vdots \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{array} \right\}^2 + \sum_{p=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ n \\ \vdots \\ p \\ \vdots \\ j \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{array} \right\}^2 \left. \vphantom{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}} \right\} = e^{-S_{ISR}} \left\{ \delta_{x=1} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \int_{Q > a_i > a_{i-1}} d^3 \eta_i \rho_{1B}^{(1)}(k_i) \right) \left[1 + \sum_{p=1}^n \beta_0^{(1)}(z_p) + \sum_{p=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} W(\tilde{k}_p, \tilde{k}_j) \right] \delta_{x=\prod_{j=1}^n x_j} \right\}$$



Summary and Prospects

- New formulation of the collinear factorization, better suited for Monte Carlo implementation is proposed.
- NLO contributions to hard process and evolution kernels are already recalculated up to NLO in the new scheme (non-singlet NLO exclusive kernels calculated).
- Implementation in the Monte Carlo is tested at the prototype level; critical MC weights are examined numerically.
- More work to be done, towards new MC for W/Z production at LHC/Tevatron and DIS process.



DGLAP Collinear QCD ISR Evolution and the Monte Carlo

1970

1980

1990

2000

2010

Moments OPE

(74) QCD: Georgi+Politzer

Diagramatic

(72) QED: Gribov+Lipatov

(77) Altarelli+Parisi

Monte Carlo

10 years

(85) Sjostrand

(88) Marchesini,Webber

NLO

Moments OPE

(78) Floratos+Ross+Sachrajda

Diagramatic

(81) Curci+Furmanski+Petronzio

Monte Carlo

27 years later

(92) Kato et.al.

(08) Jadach Skrzypek

WE ARE HERE!!!

Moments

(03) Moch+Verm.+Vogt

Diagramatic

(03) Moch+Verm.+Vogt

Monte Carlo

(15) ???

NNLO